

Patent Application No. 10/693,195

With regard to the Examiner's request for a summary of the substance of the interview of November 1, 2006, Applicant's undersigned attorney is unclear regarding what the Examiner desires to see. Applicant's undersigned attorney has never had an examiner impose such a requirement, especially in light of the fact that the Examiner already provided a summary of the substance of the interview. Specifically, during the interview Applicant's undersigned attorney discussed with the Examiner the structural and operational differences between Applicant's device and the device in Soussloff and Muellenberg. These operational differences lead to structural differences as discussed above. During the interview, the Examiner also clarified his opinion regarding the application of Muellenberg, specifically with regard to Fig. 9 from Muellenberg, which up until that discussion was not clear to Applicant's undersigned attorney based on the substance of the Official Actions.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant believes that this application is in form for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney if the Examiner believes that issues remain regarding the allowability of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL & SKILLMAN  
A Professional Corporation  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By //Stephen Eland

Stephen H. Eland

PTO Registration No. 41,010

Telephone: (215) 563-4100

Facsimile: (215) 563-4044